



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

which is however hardly complete enough fully to serve the purpose.

It would be ungracious to close this review without a final word of appreciation and commendation for a book so helpful and suggestive. If others profit by it as the writer cheerfully acknowledges that he has done, the author must feel amply repaid for his labor, though a labor of love is its own reward.

W. A. HEIDEL.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

Album Terentianum picturas continens ex imagine phototypa Lugdunensi Terentii codd. Ambrosiani H 75 et Parisini 7899 sumptas et lithographice expressas. Praefatus et picturas Latine interpretatus est JACOBUS VAN WAGENINGEN.

Scaenica Romana, Scripsit JACOBUS VAN WAGENINGEN; Groningae, in Aedibus Heredum P. Noordhoff, Anno MCMVII.

The series of *Codices Graeci et Latini photographice depicti*, issued at Leyden under the direction of S. G. de Vries, reaches in Vol. VIII (1903) the noteworthy addition of the *Codex Ambrosianus* (F) of Terence, by means of which there becomes available for the first time in extended form a reliable reproduction of the scenic pictures characteristic of the group of manuscripts represented by CPOF. The recognized value of these as a source of information for the customs of the Roman stage has long warranted a better apparatus than that afforded by the crude and ancient wood-cuts, drawn from C, of de Berger, Fortiguerra and Cocquelines, and a more comprehensive one than that produced by recent American interest in the single play of the *Phormio* (Harvard edition, Cambridge, 1894; Weston, Harv. Stud. in Class. Phil. XIV). To the Leyden publication, therefore, with its exhaustive and authoritative preface by E. Bethe, attaches a unique value which is shared, and in a measure extended, by the newer Album Terentianum professedly dependent upon it. This, in a convenient volume of one hundred and forty-eight lithographs, presents all of the pictures of the Ambrosianus, supplemented by those of the Parisinus where the other is deficient (*Andria*, Eunuchus to v. 416, *Phormio* from v. 832 to v. 1015), but is recommended more by its appeal to general usefulness than by the author's briefly appended expositions of the pictures. Correct interpretation of these and supplementary conclusions concerning the significance of portrayed gestures, must depend not only upon an intelligent use of the text, but also clearly upon a proper identification of the figures involved, since these are often erroneously designated by the copyist. The effort, therefore, is hazardous

without more critical method than in the present case is evident. In the author's ignorance of the showing in other manuscripts of the group, the impression of dilettantism might have been averted by at least a knowledge of the serviceable and scholarly work of Dr. Watson (*The Relation of the Scene-Headings to the Miniatures in Manuscripts of Terence*, Harv. Stud. 14, pp. 55-172), who has discussed most of the problems.

To cite, at Heaut. 2, 3 (v. 242) the blunder of the copyist of F, in which the names of the two young men are reversed, is responsible for the confession, *Quid in medio gestus Clitiphonis sibi vult non perspicuum*. However, in the first of the scene, to which the picture refers, since Dromo is still upon the stage (cf. v. 9), the melancholy youth is Clinia (cf. vv. 246, 247, 250), not Clitipho, and is properly drawn in attitude of distress. The vigor of action portrayed in the figure of the other, erroneously designated Clinia in F, points to the impatience of Clitipho revealed at v. 251. This correct order is shown further by COP (cf. Watson, p. 80). Again the strange misconception of the picture before Hec. 3, 4 (v. 415), apparently a heritage from Umpfenbach, is scarcely longer tolerable. Pamphilus and three slaves appear upon the stage, one of whom, a mute character, is whimsically designated in F, "Orlando". The order of Pamphilus v. 359, *Tu pueris curre Parmeno obviam*, the comment on his arrival, v. 410, *Adest Parmeno cum pueris*, and Parmeno's injunction to those he has brought, v. 429, *Ite intro*, all sufficiently explain the presence of the three slave figures in the picture which represents the situation at v. 16 ff. The slave whom Pamphilus engages is clearly Parmeno (cf. the text). Save in the erroneous identification of this character, the picture is therefore correct and leaves the author's apology, *Pictor duas imagines eiusdem scaenae ad unam iunxisse videtur*, without point (cf. Watson, p. 66 f.). Exposition of the picture before Eun. 3, 2 (v. 455) resolves itself into elaboration of the groundless criticism, *In hac imagine pictor vehementer errat*, where again not the *pictor* but only the *librarius* of P is at fault in exchanging the names of Parmeno and Chaerea. Knowledge of C, or of Watson (p. 84), or of even the text (v. 471), would have saved the wonder that, *Parmeno non servili vestitu, sed ornatu Eunuchi indutus est*. There is no attempt to depict the *verus eunuchus* (one hand shows *Eunuc' Cherea* above the figure which is really Parmeno), and that Pythias appears on the extreme right should create no surprise, since she might naturally attend her mistress throughout the scene, though her presence is not recognized before the injunction of v. 500. There is no reason to suppose that she here *in scaenam prodit*. The picture is therefore explicable and correct save for the blunder, in P, of exchanging the names of the slave and the eunuch (Chaerea) who stand side by side. Other similar matters are involved at Heaut. 5, 5 (v. 1045); Eun. 4, 7 (v. 771); Phor. 2, 3 (v. 348). Without the help of P, the so-called Demea of F should have been recog-

nized from the costume as really Geta, since he wears the κοσῦμβη of the *servus*. The interpretation, *Astat a dextra Parmeno puellae pulchritudine . . . stupefactus*, Eun. 2, 2 (v. 232), stresses too much the susceptibility of Parmeno and wars against the text: he is first imagined downcast (*tristis*, v. 267), then actually is mocking (vv. 269, 274), then impudent (v. 272). Equally undiscerning is the criticism at Eun. 4, 4 (v. 668), *Prave tamen post fores Chaerea, falsus Eunuchus, depictus est*. The superscription is correctly *Eunuc* and it is not surprising that Dorus is portrayed in the guise of the youth. Chaerea at v. 906 still appears in the eunuch's clothes; in what meanwhile was the eunuch clad? A lapse of another sort is involved at Eun. 3, 5 (v. 549), where beneath the picture the exposition is, *Gaudio exsultans . . . Chaerea dextram supra caput tollit*: on the other hand in the accompanying Scaenica Romana (p. 60) the gesture is correctly associated with the action of the *hortator* (cf. v. 562 and Quint. 11, 3, 103). It remains, therefore, that the real value of the Album rests upon the accessibility of the reproductions which is supplied, rather than upon the interpretations which are named as its *raison d'être*, and in view of the expected publication of the pictures of C, promised by Father Ehrle of the Vatican Library, it is perhaps to be regretted that the author's zeal was not transferred to the execution of a similar task for P. In point of form, the present work would prove more usable, had the scene numbering been given instead of merely the verses with which the picture is supposed to be associated.

The supplementary treatise, Scaenica Romana (67 pp., Ch. I, De theatro Romano; Ch. II, De histrionibus), supplies professedly a convenient compilation of much that has been said before, yet under the captions, *De personis sive larvis* and *De histrionum gestibus*, attains to independent value. Ribbeck's attempt to reconcile the conflicting testimony of ancient sources concerning the innovation of masks (Röm. Trag., p. 661), juggles with the chronology of Minucius Prothymus (Donat., de Com. VI, 3, Wessner), undervalues the letter of Donatus' report, and leaves in the end the whimsical practice of the squint-eyed Roscius (Diomed., K. I., p. 489; Cic., de Nat. Deor. 1, 79) the potent cause for the introduction and dominance of a custom conspicuously foreign to the Roman stage. The theory of the present author strains less one's power of credence and the testimony. From the diversity of names assigned to the principal actors of the Eun. and the Ad. in the *didascaliae* (Ambivius Turpio and Hatilius Praenestinus), and the *praefationes* of Donatus (Ambivius and Minucius), it is argued, with Dziatzko (Rh. M. 20, p. 591 ff.; 21, p. 68 ff.), that repeated performances were differently reported. The effort is, therefore, to discover the relative periods of the actors named. If Ambivius, a *senex* in 160 B. C. (Heaut., Prol. 10), lived as late as 150, and was succeeded respectively by Hatilius and Minucius (Leo, Rh. M. 38, p. 342),

the former's period of presumable activity would fall 150-130 B. C., the latter's, 130-110 B. C. Since *senes* of 91 B. C. remembered an unmasked stage (Cic., de Or. 3, 221), while men of middle age (e. g., Catulus and Crassus) did not, the introduction of masks some forty years before 91 B. C. would coincide with the *floruit* of Minucius, to whom Donatus (de Com. VI, 3) assigns the innovation. A clue to the force at work is given by Tacitus (Ann. XIV, 21), who associates with the conquest of Achaia and Asia a new order of things in public spectacles. The increasing number of actors with Greek names from this time (Aesopus, Eros, Panurgus, Antipho, Diphilus, Spinther, etc.)—Minucius himself bears the Greek cognomen Prothymus—points to the dominance of the foreign influence. Diomedes' claim for Roscius as the innovator of the mask may mark the notoriety of his defection from an opposition-set of native actors. Under *De histrionum gestibus*, there is attempted, first, a comparison of Donatus' assignments of gesture with the scenes of the manuscript and, second, an independent estimate, by the use of Quintilian, of certain gestures there portrayed. The first effort ceases after the exposition of seven categories. It might have included also, under the category of the *gestus stomachantis*, Ad. 1, 2, 5 (v. 134); 5, 3, 9 (v. 795); And. 1, 5, 2 (v. 237), and the additional categories of the *gestus mirantis*, Eun. 3, 1, 13 (v. 403); Hec. 4, 1, 7 (v. 522); *gestus comminantis*, And. 4, 4, 14 (v. 753), cf. Eun. 4, 7, 27 (v. 797); 5, 4, 26 (v. 948); *gestus exeuntis*, Eun. 3, 5, 1 (v. 549); *gestus quaerentis nec invenientis* (i. e., of perplexity), And. 1, 1, 61 (v. 84), cf. Ad. 4, 2, 46 (v. 585); *gestus irrisionis*, Ad. 4, 1, 20 (v. 536); *gestus amatoris*, Eun. 1, 2, 108 (v. 188); *et al.*—without attaining the exhaustiveness implied in *haec sunt indicia de gestu histrionis, quae in Donati commentario inveniuntur*. The later interesting attempt to expound the gestures and attitudes of the miniatures by the use of Quintilian extends the similar work of Weston upon the Phormio (Harv. Stud. 14, pp. 49-53), but again the result is often unconvincing by reason of hasty generalization and defective method. I cite only the so-called *narrantis gestus* (p. 56). The gesture is described by Quint. (11, 3, 101) as *approbantibus et narrantibus et distinguentibus decorus*: Andrea de Jorio shows it perpetuated as a Neapolitan sign of inquiry (*La mimica degli antichi investigata nel gestire napoletano*, p. 86). An effort to generalize as to its value in the miniatures should primarily involve consideration of all the occurrences. To the five cited by the author should be added: Ad. 3, 4 (v. 447); 5, 6 (v. 889); Eun. 3, 2 (v. 455); 5, 8 (v. 1031); Hec. 4, 2 (v. 577); 4, 3 (v. 607); Phor. 2, 3 (v. 348). In three of these, as revealed by the text, the gesture is clearly interrogatory: at Eun. 4, 5 (v. 727), in the case of Pythias (cf. vv. 733, 735, 736); at 5, 8 (v. 1031), Parmeno (cf. v. 1034); at Heaut. 3, 3 (v. 562), Chremes (cf. vv. 595, 596, 597, 598, 602, 605, 606, 607, 611, 612, 613). By like analysis it marks Laches *approbans* at Hec. 4, 2

(v. 577); and so, Demea (correctly in P) at Ad. 5, 6 (v. 889). In the description of the picture at Eun. 4, 7 (v. 771) no note is made of the striking difference of Thais' attitude in P and F, nor in the exposition is it clear which is described. The position of the woman and Chremes behind the door, shown only in F, is referred to; but the description of Thais is continued confusingly from P (p. 58). An evidently second-hand knowledge of the colors employed in the pictures of F and their adjustment leads to the inaccuracy of naming them *ruber* (a conclusion doubtless from Bethe's *color rubescens*) *et caeruleus* (p. 45, n. 7) and the misleading mention of Antipho's *tunica rubra* (p. 45). Since the figures of F are drawn in brownish ink and shaded characteristically in blue, the colors of the manuscript have no more scenic significance than the regularly appearing blue of the hair or the bridal yellow of Hymen's *soccus* in Catullus (61, 10). From such matters it appears that the work, justifiable in its interesting intent, lacks in execution the authority of dependable investigation.

JOHN W. BASORE.

PRINCETON.